

ENTERED

August 23, 2016

David J. Bradley, Clerk

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
CORPUS CHRISTI DIVISION

BRANDON RICHARDSON,

Plaintiff,

VS.

BRAD LIVINGSTON, *et al*,

Defendants.

§
§
§
§
§
§
§
§

CIVIL ACTION NO. 2:14-CV-00464

**ORDER ADOPTING
MEMORANDUM AND RECOMMENDATION**


Pending before the Court is “Defendants Bunch, Trevino, Hunt, and Salinas’ Motion for Summary Judgment Based on Plaintiff’s Failure to Exhaust Remedies” (D.E. 52). On June 7, 2016, United States Magistrate Judge B. Janice Ellington issued her “Memorandum and Recommendation on Defendants’ Motion for Summary Judgment.” (D.E. 62). The parties were provided proper notice of, and opportunity to object to, the Magistrate Judge’s Memorandum and Recommendation. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); FED. R. CIV. P. 72(b); General Order No. 2002-13. No objections have been filed.

When no timely objection to a magistrate judge’s memorandum and recommendation is filed, the district court need only satisfy itself that there is no clear error on the face of the record and accept the magistrate judge’s memorandum and recommendation. *Guillory v. PPG Indus., Inc.*, 434 F.3d 303, 308 (5th Cir. 2005) (*citing Douglass v. United Servs. Auto Ass’n*, 79 F.3d 1415, 1420 (5th Cir. 1996)).

Having reviewed the findings and conclusions set forth in the Magistrate Judge’s Memorandum and Recommendation (D.E. 62), summary judgment evidence, and all

other relevant documents in the record, and finding no clear error, the Court **ADOPTS** as its own the findings and conclusions of the Magistrate Judge. Accordingly, Defendants' Motion for Summary Judgment (D.E. 52) is hereby **DENIED**.

ORDERED this 23rd day of August, 2016.



NELVA GONZALES RAMOS
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE